IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL W.P.NO.2674 OF 2006

Ashok Keshav Pawar ..Petitioner

Vs.

Keshav Tukaram Pawar & Ors. ..Respondents

...

Mr.S.R.Deshmukh for Tanaji Mhatugade Advocate for Petitioner
Mr.S.R.Shinde A.P.P. for the State

...

CORAM: SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.
DATE : FEBRUARY 21, 2007

P.C.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner. The petitioner is the son of respondent nos.1 and 2. Respondent nos.1 and 2 had filed an application for maintenance against the petitioner in the Court of 3rd Judicial Magistrate F.C., Ratnagiri. The said application came to be allowed and respondent nos.1 and 2 were granted maintenance of Rs.500/- each. Being aggrieved thereby, the petitioner preferred revision before the Sessions Court at Ratnagiri. the said revision came to be dismissed by order dated 4.11.2006. Being aggrieved thereby, the present writ petition has been preferred.

2. I have perused the judgment and order of both the Courts below as well as the evidence lead by the parties. After going through the evidence, it is seen that the petitioner has not brought out any source of income in respect of either of his parents. Though, it is the petitioner's case that his father has paddy crop land, separate property at village Someshwar as well as mango trees, no evidence has been lead to substantiate this claim. Except bringing on record that the father of the petitioner has two houses in village Someshwar, no source of income has been brought out. It has not been brought on record that the two houses owned by the father of the petitioner in the village, are a source of income in any manner. From the record, it is clear that the parents of the petitioner have no source of income. Looking to the facts of this case and the evidence on record, no case is made out for interference.

3. Writ petition is dismissed.

[V.K.Tahilramani, J.]